

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed February 27, 2008. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Objections to the Specification

The Final Office Action objected to the Specification because "Applicant's specification [p. 55-92] includes computer program listing having over 300 lines." In a Response filed November 8, 2007, Applicants included a compact disc that includes Pages 55-92 of Applicants' specification as a computer program listing appendix, amended the paragraph beginning at Line 2 on Page 1 to incorporate the computer program listing appendix, and attached a transmittal letter in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.96(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.52(e).

The Final Office Action noted that "[t]he computer program listing should be removed from the specification." Applicants have provided an instruction that identifies the paragraphs to delete from the Specification in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(b). Favorable action is requested.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0023957 to Bau, III et al. ("Bau") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0110242 to Brown et al. ("Brown"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of generating keys for object(s) in a Web Services arrangement. At least one object based on at least one of a plurality of Universal Description, Discovery and Integration (UDDI) objects is stored as an entry in a directory. The directory

includes a hierarchical organization of a plurality of entries. Each of the plurality of entries has a plurality of attributes. It is determined if the at least one object has a defined first key. If the at least one object has a defined first key, the defined first key is provided for the at least one object as a naming attribute for the entry corresponding to the at least one object in the directory. The defined first key uniquely identifies the entry in the directory. If the at least one object does not have a defined first key, a second key for the at least one object is provided as the naming attribute for the entry corresponding to the at least one object in the directory. The second key uniquely identifies the entry in the directory. The cited references do not teach or suggest each of the limitations.

For example, the cited references fail to teach or suggest “storing at least one object based on at least one of a plurality of Universal Description, Discovery and Integration (UDDI) objects as an entry in a directory.” *Bau* is directed to a system that generates a unique identifier for a SOAP message passed between a client and web server. *See Bau*, Column 4, Paragraph 37. “The identifier is passed between the client and web service by way of a SOAP based message header.” *See Bau*, Column 4, Paragraph 37. The generated SOAP message as taught by *Bau* fails to teach or suggest storing at least one object based on at least one UDDI object as an entry in a directory. Therefore, *Bau* fails to teach or suggest “storing at least one object based on at least one of a plurality of Universal Description, Discovery and Integration (UDDI) objects as an entry in a directory.” *Brown* fails to cure this deficiency.

Similar to Claim 1, Claim 6 includes limitations generally directed to storing at least one object based on at least one of a plurality of Universal Description, Discovery and Integration (UDDI) objects as an entry in a directory. For at least those reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that the cited references do not teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 6. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 1 and 6 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 2-5 and 7-12 each depend, directly or indirectly, from Claims 1 or 6. For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 2-5 and 7-12 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Luke Pedersen, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6655.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTT S L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Luke K. Pedersen
Reg. No. 45,003

Correspondence Address:

Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6494

Date: 4/24/08

Customer Number: 05073